

Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the review of the application. Claims 1-104 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-28, 30-57, 59-65, 68-80, and 82-104 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Ryzin (U.S. Patent No. 6,127,941). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As will be fully explained below, Van Ryzin does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 26, 53, 78, and 90 as required in a proper Section 102 rejection. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assessments made in the Office Action and respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons discussed below, the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

For a Section 102 rejection to be valid, the cited prior art reference must disclose all features of the claimed inventions. Consequently, a claim is anticipated only if each and every feature as set forth in the claim is found, and the identical invention is shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Van Ryzin does not disclose all features of independent claims 1, 26, 53, 78, and 90.

Among the many differences between the claimed invention and the teachings of the Van Ryzin reference, the Van Ryzin reference does not disclose or suggest a controllee device providing a remote control with a first collection of user interface displays for controlling the controllee electronic apparatus. In contrast to the claimed invention, the portions of Van Ryzin cited by the Office teach that a software cartridge attached to the remote control contains specifications for controlling operating the controllee devices (see Van Ryzin, column 3 lines 55-

61). The Examiner is respectfully directed to column 5 lines 3-19 of Van Ryzin which states as follows:

When the ID codes returned from the transceiver 132 are received by the remote control unit 100 and the transceiver 116 in particular, the received information is supplied to the microprocessor 112 for appropriate processing. Namely, by executing specific instructions in the memory 114 as obtained from the cartridge 110 containing the specifications for the system components, the microprocessor 112 is operative to display graphical representations of each device on the display 104. If the microprocessor 112 determines that one or more of the received ID codes does not have a corresponding device specification in the cartridge 110, an error message is displayed on the display 104 indicating by a graphical block representation that an unknown component is present in the system. In this situation, the user may update the information in the cartridge 110 by obtaining a new cartridge containing the specifications for all of the components in the system. (Emphasis added.)

② As can be seen, the remote control device as taught by Van Ryzin does not receive specification data from the controllee device but instead receives such data from the cartridge 110. Therefore, if a new controllee device is attached to the system, unless specification data is received from a new cartridge 110 or data is received from a PC (see Van Ryzin column 7, lines 4-15, Van Ryzin Figure 2), neither of which is a ^{yes, they are} controllee device 9 (See Van Ryzin Figure 2), the graphical representation of the newly attached controllee device cannot be displayed on the control device of Van Ryzin. Consequently, Van Ryzin does not teach or suggest a controllee device providing a remote control with a first collection of user interface displays for controlling the controllee electronic apparatus because the remote control device of Van Ryzin only receives specification data for a controllee device from the cartridge 110 or a PC (see Van Ryzin column 7, lines 4-15). Therefore, Van Ryzin does not disclose all features of the claimed inventions as claimed in claims 1, 26, 53, 78, and 90. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejection for independent claims 1, 26, 53, 78, and 90. Applicant also

not in claims
But it is two-way

submits that all the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103


Claims 6, 15, 29, 58, 66, 67, 81 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that the deficiencies of the Van Ryzin reference as discussed above in reference to the Section 102 rejection are also applicable here. At the very least, the Van Ryzin reference does not disclose or suggest a controllee device providing a remote control with a first collection of user interface displays for controlling the controllee electronic apparatus. Consequently, the Office fails to make a prima facie showing of obviousness as is required in a Section 103 rejection because the cited prior art fails to suggest or disclose all the features of the claimed inventions. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the Section 102 rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 15, 29, 58, 66, 67, 81 are allowable over the cited prior art.

As a result, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 689-1250. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the

Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393. A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Date: 12/9/03

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT


Edmund H. Mizumoto
Reg. No. 46,938

Customer No. 25943
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste. 1600-1900
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: (206) 622-1711
FAX: (206) 292-0460